DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 342 120 EA 023 739

AUTHOR Richardson, M. D.; And Others
TITLE Staff Development As a Function of Organizational Development.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of States on Inservice Education (Orlando, FL, November 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Continuing Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Education; *Organizational Change; *Organizational Development; *Professional Development; *Staff Development

ABSTRACT

Skills required for developing staff evaluation models are closely linked to skills required for staff development. Leading a vital, growing, innovative, dynamic school system requires risk-taking, stretching, painful, exhilarating change. This change is accomplished through staff development. Real staff development is not confined to one or two in-service days when the faculty listens to a motivating speaker, attends a show and tell workshop, and chats with co-workers over coffee and danish. Staff development that promotes true school improvement demands thoughtful, long-term planning; commitment to specific goals; and the same tender nurturing from administration that is required in guiding a child through adolescence. To do this, administrators need the ability to: conduct system and staff needs assessment to identify areas for concentrated staff development and resource allocation for new personnel. (22 references) (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED342120

STAFF DEVELOPMENT AS A FUNCTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

M. D. RICHARDSON
J. L. FLANIGAN
R. L. PRICKETT

A paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the **NATIONAL COUNCIL OF STATES ON INSERVICE EDUCATION** in Orlando, FL, November 16-20, 1990.

Mike Richardson is associate professor of Educational Administration and **Jack Flanigan** is associate professor and Coordinator of Educational Administration, both at **Clemson University**, Clemson, SC. **Robert Prickett** is assistant professor and Coordinator of Educational Administration at **Western Kentucky University**, Bowling Green, KY.

EA 023 739

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Richardson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STAFF DEVELOPMENT AS A FUNCTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ABSTRACT

Skills required for developing staff evaluation models are closely linked to skills required for staff development. Leading a vital, growing, innovative, dynamic school system requires risk-taking, stretching, painful, exhilarating change. This change is accomplished through staff development. Real staff development is not confined to one or two in-service days when the faculty listens to a motivating speaker, attends a show and tell workshop, and chats with co-workers over coffee and danish. Staff development that promotes true school improvement demands thoughtful, long-term planning; commitment to specific goals; and the same tender nurturing from administration that is required in guiding a child through adolescence. To do this, administrators need the ability to: conduct system and staff needs assessment to identify areas for concentrated staff development and resource allocation for new personnel.

INTRODUCTION

Effective staff development is related to the development of an organization. (Hunter, 1988). It merges the personal growth needs of individuals in an organization and the formal institutional needs of the system. Without the linkage, systemwide improvement in an organization does not take place. Staff development and organization development have been defined as follows:

STAFF DEVELOPMENT: Staff development is a process designed to foster personal and professional growth for individuals within a respectful, supportive positive organizational climate having as its ultimate aim better learning for students, and continuous, responsible self-renewal for educators and schools.

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Organizational development is the process undertaken by an organization, or part of an organization, to define and meet changing self-improvement objectives, while making it possible for the individuals in the organization to meet their personal and professional objectives (Snyder, 1983).

Together the terms staff development and organization development form the "gestalt" of school improvement. Both terms are relatively new to the literature of education. The overall purpose of organizational development is to enhance the ability of an organization to achieve its goals

and to improve the "quality of life" within the organization. In many ways the two terms have overlapping goals. Today, we can all agree that staff development is such an issue, one that affects those in educational leadership positions as perhaps no other issue will.

CHANGE AND GROWTH

Change and growth are endemic in our complex modern society: the school or staff which does not change and grow is destined to atrophy, to become obsolete, and to be a burden rather than a bulwark to us and to the communities we serve. This is particularly true in view of the increasing pressure out on our institutions by the upward expansion of the whole learning cycle.

We can no longer consider an individual's education complete after 12 to 14 years of formal schooling. (Clark, 1985). Learning and growth take place throughout an individual's lifetime and must continually be a renewing process. Therefore, we must deal with organization organizational growth and with staff development that will adequately serve both the organization and the individual. In short, we and the institutions which serve us must be self-renewing.

This requirement for self-renewal comes in a climate where teachers are apprehensive about the process of evaluation, distrustful of accountability, and fearful that they will become the scapegoat for

innovations that didn't work and about which they were unexcited in the first place. In addition, our society gives high priority to tangible things - new buildings, for example - and is generally uninterested in the tangible - staff development.

The most common form of staff development identified is the workshop or lecture pertaining to in-service programs, typically occurring at the end of the working day or before the school year begins, and at a site other than the school. (Davis & Nicklos, 1986).

In-service training has as its goal the professional growth of the teacher: but as a concept it includes the plan, the program, or the effort of the local school system to accomplish that end.

One of the hallmarks of a true professional, whatever his profession, is a never-ceasing zeal to learn. Unfortunately, not all members of the various professions possess this zeal, and regrettably, this includes members of all branches of the teaching profession. Because it is easy to become involved with the obviously necessary duties of teaching, administration, or supervision, keeping up with new developments in the field of education is wistfully regarded by some as a luxury. Those who maintain this concept soon find themselves holding firmly to the status and for they have no basis for growth. Decisions are made in terms of knowledge that is at best incomplete. Soon their schools lack the vitality and drive that characterize

good schools everywhere.

What is needed is the realization that keeping up to date is not a luxury at all but one of the most compelling necessities. Because of this realization, programs of in-service education have become more and more common in schools of the United States. (Griffin, 1986).

Because of the variety of activities that may be termed in-service education, there are a number of definitions. Among the most useful is that offered by Curtin, who says: "Broadly conceived, in-service education includes all activities engaged in by the professional personnel during their service and designed to contribute to improvement on the job."

Two items of significance are explicit in this definition. One is that in-service education never stops "during their service." The second is that these programs "contribute to improvement on the job." Thus Curtin asks nothing less than constant improvement throughout the career of an educator. It is a demanding but necessary definition and one with enormous implications. In order for staff development and in-service training to be productive, a well designed needs assessment must be conducted.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

What is a needs assessment? Essentially it is an assessment of the difference between what is and what should be. A needs assessment can deal

with inputs, processes, products, outputs, and outcomes. It can focus on elements within the system or external to the system, identify needed organization efforts, results or specify societal goals and objectives. In design, it can be simplistic or comprehensive. However constructed, it is the basic problem-solving tool for any organization or institution. Used effectively by school administrators, staff development will provide the foundation for long-term growth and self-renewal of the system.

This problem-solving process has six steps: (1) Identify problem based on needs. (2) Determine solution requirements and identify solution alternatives. (3) Select solution strategies from among alternatives. (4) Implement selected methods and means. (5) Determine performance effectiveness. (6) Revise as required. (Doggett, 1987).

The Florida State Department of Education provides excerpts from a study of staff-development programs. The study includes:

1. School-based programs in which teachers participate as helpers to each other and planners of in-service activities tend to have greater success than do programs conducted by college or other outside personnel without assistance of teachers.

2. In-service education programs that have differentiated training experiences for different teachers (that is, "individualized") are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs that have common

activities for all participants.

3. In-service education programs that place the teacher in an active role (constructing and generating materials, ideas, and behavior) are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs that place the teacher in a receptive role.

4. In-service education programs in which teachers share and provide mutual assistance to each other are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs in which each teacher does separate work.

5. Teachers are more likely to benefit from in-service programs in which they can choose goals and activities for themselves, as contrasted with programs in which the goals and activities are preplanned. (Little, 1981).

ADULT LEARNERS

Notice the importance given to teacher involvement in planning, differentiated experiences for different teachers, active roles, using ideas, materials, and behavior found in the actual teaching situation, teachers working with and helping other teachers, and teacher goals.

Adult learners differ in import ways. They react differently to educational environments, preferring various levels of structures, task complexity, attention to personal needs, feedback about performances, and risk-taking.

In a recent, relatively large study of staff development practices, teachers, teacher educators, staff developers, administrators, and parents of school-age students are surveyed in various parts of the country regarding their views of in-service education. While a little more than a quarter of all types of respondents believed staff development practices were generally of desired quality, over 40 percent perceived present practice as only fair and nearly another 30 percent indicated that in-service was in poor condition. In-service activities for the new teacher during the critical first teaching reported that problems persisted throughout their teaching careers. (Mazzarella, 1982). Help must be given to all teachers; beginning, superior, and senior, in order to meet the changing needs of society and the school environment.

BEGINNING TEACHERS

The teachers most in need of help and the ones who should profit most by the help given, are the beginning teachers. (Lodish, 1985). A principal often fails to appreciate the difficulties that a beginning teacher encounters. For many reasons, the beginning teacher may experience difficulties before the principal realizes that a problem exists. A beginning teacher, with little experience in the profession, soon finds that adjustment to the school society, administration, and supervision is not easy. The orientation of the

beginning teacher must be thorough and constructive. A the start, a new teacher should not be given extra responsibilities, such as work on committees.

EXPERIENCED TEACHERS

While giving due attention to the beginning teachers and/or to the weak teachers, the supervising principal may tend to forget to encourage and help the superior teachers. Perhaps as a consequence of their apparent competency in teaching or supervising other school activities.

The principal may consider that their abilities need no further growth. Such as idea, or unconscious negligence, may result in complacency, which could result in the creation of a static condition that would be injurious to a member of any profession.

The experienced teacher should be used as a supervising master teacher. He/she should assist the less experienced or the beginning teacher through demonstration teaching, through supervisory conferences, and - perhaps more importantly - through friendship and through Examples at informal get-togethers.

Teachers do grow older - and they don't just fade away. Some of our best teachers are older teachers. The supervisor may feel that some of them are

seeking the easiest way to complete their final years in service, or even that they may prevent change through dictation on the basis of their seniority.

CONCLUSION

The supervising principal must realize that it is important to recognize and utilize the worth of each teacher, including the older teacher. It is the principal's responsibility to insure that the older teacher does not lose a sense of leadership and importance.

It has been the intent of this paper to submit research findings relating to the importance of effective inservice and staff development programs. These programs and on-going processes need to pulse gently in tune with the lives of professionals and the organizations in which they work. The work ahead is to build flowing systems of staff development which helps educators enrich their lives and competence, faculties improve their schools, and school systems initiate curricular and organizational changes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alfonso, R.J. (1975). Instructional supervision: A behavior system. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Brookover, W. (1982). Creating effective schools. Florida: Learning Publications.

Clarke, C. (1985). A comprehensive program of evaluation and professional development: A working model. NASSP Bulletin, 72, 19-24.

Crosby, M.E. (1957). Supervision as co-operative action. New York: Appleton-Cantury-Crofts.

Curtin, J.R. (1964). Supervision in today's elementary schools. Canada: The Macmillan Company.

Davis, L.E. (1988 February). Instructional problem solving in staff development: The principal's role as an instructional leader. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Orlando, FL.

Doggett, M. (1987). Staff development: Eight leadership behaviors for principals. NASSP Bulletin, 71, 4-10.

Ducharine, E.P. (1985) The rural and small school principalship: Practice, research, and vision. NASSP Bulletin, 65, 10-14.

Glickman C.D. (1987). Instructional improvement and the K-8 principal. Streamlined-Seminar. 5, 4.

Griffin, G. (1986). Chapter 1 and the regular school: Staff development. Educational Leadership. 40.

Hannay, L.M. (1985). Involuntary teacher transfer: An intervention strategy for professional development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Canada

Hovla, J. (1985). Skills for successful school leaders. Virginia: Congressional Arts Enterprises

Hunter M. (1989). Staff meetings that produce staff development. Principal, 67. 44-45

Lewis J.J. (1972). Critical issues in education: A problem- solving guide for school administrators. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Lodish, R. (1985). A school alive. Principal. 64, 28-31.

Marks, J.R. (1985). Handbook of Education supervision: A guide for the practitioner. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

McIntire, R.G. (April, 1983). Continual professional growth by teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada

Nortingham, H, and Dawson, J. (1987). Factors for consideration in supervision and evaluation. Principal, 68 20-24.

Sergiovanni, T and Starratt, R.J. (1983). Supervision: Human perspectives. New York; Mc Graw-Hill.

Snyder, M.J. (1983). Instructional leadership for productive schools. Educational Leadership, 40, 32-37

Spears, H. (1958). Improving the supervision of instruction. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Van-Voorrees, B.C. (1984, April). Staff development for school improvement: Field testing a model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.